



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


RECEIVED

FEB 12 2004

TC 1700

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service Express Mail Label No. EL 474178 222 US this 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2002.

  
Kenneth Solomon, Reg. No. 31,427

Application of: Luthra, et al.

Group No.: 1713

Serial No.: 09/587,875

Atty. Docket No.: 66230-4923

Filed: June 6, 2000

For: Non-Thrombogenic and Anti-Thrombogenic Polymers

Examiner: Christopher Henderson

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

HONORABLE SIR:

In compliance with Rule 1.111 of the Rules of Practice, Applicants submit this paper in response to the Office Action, mailed July 1, 2001. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider and enter the following amendments and remarks intended to put the above-identified application into form for allowance.

Restriction

The restriction requirement does not match the pending claims. The pending claims are claims 43, 44 and 107-112 as shown on the attached sheet. The only claims which match those in the identification of inventions in the requirement are claims 43 and 44. With respect to those claims, Applicant elects (in the event the restriction requirement is maintained) the invention of claim 43. Claims 107-110 (which Applicant understands have been renumbered

RECEIVED  
MAY 03 2004  
TC 1700


as claims 47-50) depend from claim 43 and so are understood to remain under consideration as well.

Although Applicant has elected an invention, Applicant also traverses the restriction requirement. Claim 44 and those that depend therefrom depend from provisionally elected claim 43 and so should be examined therewith. The restriction requirement states that the inventions of claims 43 and 44 are distinct if the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. Claim 44 specifically calls for the product made to be that of claim 43 and the Examiner has not alleged any process other than that of claim 44 by which the product of claim 43 can be made. Therefore, the restriction requirement is misplaced.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and early allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**Thompson Coburn LLP**



---

Kenneth Solomon  
Reg. No. 31,427  
One US Bank Plaza  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
Telephone: 314-552-6305  
Fax: 314-552-7305